

A SURVEY OF THREE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS
IN SAINT FRANCIS COUNTY, ARKANSAS

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

BY
TEMPLE WILLIAMS MOOREHEAD

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

AUGUST, 1965

R vi

T 62

DEDICATION

To

My Husband Walter N. Moorehead, Sr.

My Son Walter N. Moorehead, Jr.

My Mother Rae Mae Williams

My Father Homer Williams

for their encouragement and moral support throughout
the period of my graduate study.

T. W. M.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer takes this opportunity to express gratitude to all who have contributed towards the completion of this study. The writer is indebted to the principals, teachers and the lunchroom personnels of the Stewart Elementary School, and the Christ Church School of Saint Francis County, Arkansas.

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to Dr. Laurence E. Boyd for his patience, understanding, and valuable guidance in the organization of the materials for this study.

T. W. M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Rationale	1
Evolution of the Problem	6
Contribution to Educational Knowledge	6
Statement of the Problem	7
Purpose of the Study	7
Scope and Limitation of the Study	8
Definition of Terms	8
Locale of the Study	8
Socio-Economic Background of Saint Francis County	8
Method of Research	12
Description of Subjects	13
Description of Instruments	13
Method of Procedure	13
Criteria of Reliability	15
Collection of Data	15
II. SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE	16
Frame of Reference	16
Points of View of Authorities	17
A Description of the National School Lunch Program	22
Trends in the School Market for Food	26
A Brief History of the School Lunch Program	28
III. ORGANIZATION AND TREATMENT OF DATA	37
Prefatory Statement	37
A Brief History of the School Lunch Program in Saint Francis County School System	38
Curricula in the Three Selected Schools	39
Standards for An Effective School Lunch Program	40
Participation in Lunchroom Program	43
Types of Lunch Served	45
Devices Used to Stimulate Lunchroom Participation	45

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter	Page
III. ORGANIZATION AND TREATMENT OF DATA (Cont'd)	
Source of Income for Labor, Food and Equipment . .	47
Types of Lunchroom Equipment	47
Educational Status of the Lunchroom Personnel . .	47
Personnel and the Types of Markets Involved in the Purchase of Foods	50
Pay Periods and Aggregate Pay of Lunchroom Per- sonnel	51
Income Received from Sale of Lunches and Expendi- tures for Labor	52
Summary of the Basic Findings	54
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	56
Introductory Statement	56
Recapitulation of the Locale and Research Design .	56
Prefatory Statement	56
Locale and Period	57
Subjects	57
Instruments	57
Criterion of Reliability	57
Evolution of the Problem	57
Contribution to Educational Knowledge	57
Statement of the Problem	57
Purpose of the Study	57
Summary of Related Literature	58
Conclusions	59
Implications	59
Recommendations	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY	62
APPENDIX	64
VITA	

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Data Showing Average Number of Pupils Buying, Bringing and Eating Free Lunch in the Three School Lunch Programs. .	44
2. Devices Used to Stimulate Participation in the Three Lunchroom Programs and the Number of Teachers Using Them	46
3. Source of Income for Labor, Food and Equipment in the School Lunch Program	48
4. Types of Lunch-Room Equipment in the Three Schools	49 .
5. Educational Status of the Lunchroom Personnel in the the Three Schools	50
6. The Personnel and the Types of Markets Involved in the Purchase of Foods for the Cafeterias of the Three Schools	51
7. Pay Periods and Aggregate Pay of Lunchroom Personnel . .	52
8. Income Received from the Sale of Lunches and Expenditures for Labor Per Week	53

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale.--Today the people of the United States have the greatest opportunities for advancement for happiness and for service that they have ever known. They, too, have the greatest responsibilities for health, for education and for sharing their way of life with all the peoples of the world.

Educators realize the important role that the school lunch program plays in the physical, mental, and emotional development of children. The National School Lunch Program assumes a great role in today's educational program through such factors as school consolidation, transportation of children, and through its use as an educational asset in the daily education program of children.

Eating is one of the most important factors in the child's everyday life. What he eats has a lot to do with his physical growth, development, and good health.

The four most important reasons for eating are the four needs for food. The first need is for building material; the second is for material to repair and replace worn-out cells and tissues; the third is to supply the body with heat and energy; and the fourth need is to regulate body functions.

The school lunch program is a natural setting for pupils to develop

desirable food habits; to become better informed as to the kind and amounts of food needed by the body and why they are needed. Eating in the school lunchroom provides many worthwhile learning experiences which will contribute to emotional, spiritual, aesthetic and social development of pupils, as well as to their physical development.¹

The extent to which the lunch program is used effectively to broaden and enrich the experiences of children will depend upon the understanding and cooperative planning of the total school staff, parents and others in the community.

Obviously, beyond its purposes of providing at least one nutritious meal per day for hungry children, the school lunchroom can become a remarkable educational resource for students of all ages. Among other things, it affords the teacher a unique opportunity to evaluate her pupils eating practices and use this information unobtrusively in later classroom activities, young people can learn to eat and like a variety of foods; can become aware of the principles underlying the proper food-handling and preparation and the intelligent assessment of food values. Pupils may even become cognizant of subtle matters such as: consumer costs; the relationship between food and culture; good table manners and conversation; and generally, of the beneficial effects of a leisurely meal.

Even in small schools where there are not any lunchrooms at all, the very fundamental necessity of eating may be employed to an educational advantage. A teacher of six-year-old pupils in a rural school without any lunchroom facilities staged a class breakfast. How was this done? The

¹Edwina Jones, The Road to Health (Ohio: Laidlow Brothers, Inc., 1959), pp. 11-12.

orange juice was squeezed at home and brought to school in jars. The oatmeal was donated and cooked by a room-mother that lived near the school. Milk was delivered at the last minute and served in the cartons. The desks were arranged for suitable tables with attractive place mats and many other improvisations of equipment were shared by pupils. The pupils entertained the principal and several other parents as guests. After the meal was over, the clean-up committee took over.

So it was that the children planned, prepared, and enjoyed an adequate balanced breakfast, many of them for the first time. In the process, they had functioned through committees. Food costs had been computed and divided among class members. An invitation to the guests had been composed, and the event reported to the local newspaper. Art pupils had designed and made the place mats.

The reward for the teacher came a few weeks later. One morning, during the sharing period, one of the pupils said: "Teacher, this morning we had orange juice and oatmeal with our toast; all the days before we had coffee and biscuits with jelly for breakfast. And tomorrow, mother says we will have fresh milk just like we had in school."

The school lunch was originated for the sole purpose of improving the child's daily nutritional in-take. It had its earliest beginning in Germany, France, and other continental countries, but its most rapid development began in England early in the 1900's. At the time of the Boer War (1900), England discovered that three out of five men who presented themselves for military services were physically unfit. An investigation of the causes suggested that this physical condition was due to malnutrition during childhood. The final outcome of this discovery was the passage of the Provision of the Meal Act of 1906, which gave local school authori-

ties the power to use school funds to establish lunches for malnourished children.¹

The national school lunch program helps make it possible for our young people to enjoy a lunch rich in the essential elements of a good diet and helps them to learn the benefits to be derived from good nutrition. The serving of a nutritious lunch to 16 million children daily, in 68,000 schools, entails the consumption of foods from the entire range and variety of items that are so abundantly and efficiently produced by our farmers, and the employment of the unexcelled skills and techniques of our highly developed food marketing system. The national school lunch programs represents one of the nation's best examples of a cooperative Local-State-Federal partnership for the benefit of a most important segment of our population. In order to gain recognition from citizens and civic groups for the work of the national school lunch program, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, call upon the people of the United States to observe the week beginning October 13, 1963 as National School Lunch Week.²

The rapid development of the lunchroom programs in recent years has given new impetus to their function. There is a great need for administering to children the services that will provide the physical basis for mental alertness necessary for academic accomplishments. This can be achieved

¹Ethel A. Martin, Roberts Nutrition Work With Children (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), pp. 44-45.

²Arkansas School Food Service Association. "Proclamation 3552." (North Little Rock Arkansas: North Little Rock Press, 1963), p. 2.

in proportion as the nutritional and general health of children are improved. Provision for serving nutritional and educational needs of pupils is of vast importance. The need for a hot lunch on the elementary level is real. Educators need to give the program guidance and lead in adjusting the modern elementary school to a day program that truly provides for the whole child.¹

More than 3¼ million Arkansas school children line up each year in 959 school lunchrooms throughout the state to enjoy meals planned by local nutritionists and prepared by school personnel. Each year the program increases and contributes to the health and well being of tomorrow's citizens.²

The nutritious and economical lunches aid in the learning process and are a part of the National School Program. Students payments, though nominal, cover 60 per cent of the cost of the lunches. The United States Department of Agriculture provides about 20 per cent of the total cost in cash and food with the remainder coming from state and local contributions. The average cost of lunches is thirty cents. The state reimburses local school districts five cents per serving. Total Federal funds received in 1962-63 amounted to \$1,444,656.00. Value of commodities received from the Department of Agriculture averages \$4,322.00 annually.³

¹Millard D. Bell, "Need for a Lunchroom in an Elementary School," Nations Schools, XLVII (October, 1953), p. 65.

²Clara Tibbets, "School Lunch Program," Arkansas School Food Services, (North Little Rock Arkansas: Arkansas School Food Services, 1963), p. 9.

³Agriculture Extension Services, A Food Plan for Arkansas Families, Circular 128 (Pine Bluff, Arkansas: Arkansas Agriculture Association, 1960), pp. 13-15.

In conclusion, the integration of the school lunch programs with the various health services and with the effort made to create a healthful school environment has been expressed here in many everyday examples. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that instructions are best geared to individual differences in pupils and their needs at a given time. Moreover, careful faculty planning is a prerequisite for a truly successful utilization of these and other experiences.

Evolution of the problem.--The problem of this study evolved out of the belief on the part of the writer, who is a home economist, that there is a need to investigate the school lunch program of the three schools in terms of their adequacy, as measured by recognized and acceptable standards. The writer believes that the school lunch program is a natural setting for pupils to develop desirable food habits, to become better informed as to the kind and amount of foods needed by the body, and why they are needed.

Further, the writer believes that the lunchroom can be used to provide educational experiences within the school, for it affords the teacher a unique opportunity to evaluate her pupils' eating practices and use them as a frame-of-reference for training in acceptable and desirable social graces.

Contribution to educational knowledge.--The possible contributions to educational knowledge expected from this study are:

1. It may indicate that the educational program to be housed is the first consideration in planning any part of a school program.
2. It may indicate that the school lunch learning opportunities extend beyond the physical benefits of the actual consumption of food.

3. It may indicate that learning opportunities are provided in such ways as nutrition education, the practice of acceptable social behavior, suitable conversation, respect for others, self-reliance, cleanliness, broader eating habits and the expression of gratitude.
4. It may provide teachers, principals and administrative personnel with useful data which will aid in evaluating and implementing a better lunchroom program in the Forrest City School District.

Statement of the problem.--The problem involved in this study was to determine the "status" of the School Lunch Program, together with whatever educational opportunities are provided therein, in three schools in Saint Francis County, Arkansas, 1964-65.

Purpose of the study.--The major purpose of this study was to survey and determine the present status of the three selective lunchroom programs in Saint Francis County, Arkansas, with reference to probable implications for the improvement of these programs.

More specifically, the purposes of this research were to determine:

1. The accepted standards for school lunch programs.
2. The physical facilities provided for the school lunch program in each of the three schools of Saint Francis County, Arkansas, 1964-65.
3. The equipment provided the school lunch program in each of the three schools of Saint Francis County, Arkansas, 1964-65.
4. The employment qualifications and policies for the personnel employed in the three school lunch programs.
5. The size of personnel connected with the school lunch programs in the three schools.
6. The type of menus served in the school lunchroom of each school.
7. The extent of participation (pupils and teachers) in the school lunch program in each of the schools.

8. The fiscal organization and operation of the school lunch program in each of the three schools.
9. The types of educational experiences provided pupils through the school lunch program at each of the three schools.
10. The social accomplishments achieved through the school lunch program in each of the three schools.
11. The implications for the improvement of the school lunch programs in Saint Francis County, Arkansas as indicated by the analysis and interpretation of the data.

Scope and limitation of the study.--The study was confined to the "status" of the school lunch room programs in three selected schools in Saint Francis County, Arkansas, during the 1964-65 academic year.

Definition of terms.--The basic terms used in this study are defined as follows:

1. "School lunchroom" refers to any portion of the school building in which food is cooked or otherwise prepared.
2. "Equipment" refers to those utensils and fixtures which are used in the school lunchrooms.
3. "Supplies" refers to the food stuffs that are prepared and served in school lunchrooms.
4. "Educative Values" refers to the influences and conditions which modify the behavior patterns of those persons who are recipients of the lunch.

Locale of the study.--The locale of this research is described under two major captions: (a) socio-economic background of Saint Francis County and (b) locale and description of the three schools.

Socio-economic backgrounds of Saint Francis County.--Saint Francis County is located in northeast Arkansas. It is bounded on the east by Crittenden County, on the south by Lee County, on the north by Cross County, and on the west by Monroe and Wooruff Counties. It contains an areas of 407,040 acres of land and is divided into twelve municipal

townships.

The Saint Francis and L'anguille rivers cross the county from north to south, dividing it into nearly three equal divisions, which topographically have their distinctive features: that lying east of the Saint Francis River being generally level, sloping toward the Mississippi River. The central division, between the Saint Francis and L'anguille Rivers, is divided by Crowley's Ridge which is nearly equi-distance between the two rivers, having an average altitude of 300 feet above sea level. The county west of the L'anguille River is gently sloping and slightly underlaid.

The county seat is Forrest City, which is the largest city. Other towns of importance are Hughes, Palestine, Wheatly, Colt, Madison, and Widener.

Four centers in the county have high schools, three have banking, medical, and other services. The main centers are Forrest City, Hughes, Palestine, and Wheatley.

The county as a whole had a net loss in population of 9.6 per cent between 1950 and 1960. Of the twelve townships in the county only one had an increase in population. All the towns and villages had an increase in population. The greatest population was in townships where farming opportunities were limited and where the land was unsuitable for farming. The overall loss in the county population was due chiefly to changes in methods of farming (mechanization and new technology) prospects of better employment opportunities in other areas, and some dissatisfaction with local conditions.¹

¹U. S. Census of Population, Arkansas General Social, and Economic Characteristics: 1960, Population, II, 93.

Migration in Saint Francis County is about the same as that for the state as a whole. Migration has been from the farms to the towns and from the farm to other areas.

The economy and level of living in Saint Francis County have been upgraded. During the past ten years the economic development has progressed very rapidly, in terms of providing new employment opportunities and services for local people. The drastic changes which have been brought on by improved methods in farming and the effect that this has had on a large number of people has been absorbed, to some degree, through the local industrial development program. Six plants are already in operation, two of these are relatively new ones. Another one, plant, which is not now operating at full capacity, opened in April of this year. Peak employment at this plant will be 400 or more people. All of these plants have announced a policy stating that there will be no discrimination in the hiring of personnel to fill jobs and other positions.

Statistics from the 1950 and 1960's show that the economic development for Saint Francis County is being steadily improved. Eight different religious denominational groups serve the people of Saint Francis County. In Forrest City alone, which is the largest city, there are eighteen churches for white and sixteen for Negroes. During the past ten years the number of churches in the rural areas and the membership in these churches has decreased. Membership in the town churches has increased because of the heavy migration of people from rural areas. Since 1954 several new churches have been constructed. Many others have either improved or added on new facilities. Also in many rural neighborhoods churches have been abandoned. In some areas of the county churches have consolidated

in order to have a good program. All of this is an indication that the religious atmosphere in the county is very good.¹

In Saint Francis County there are five public school districts and one private school. These are the Forrest City, Hughes, Palestine, Wheatley, and the County District. The private school is located in Forrest City. It is a high school and is operated for Negroes by the Episcopal Church. In the Forrest City and Hughes districts there are two high schools, one for Negroes and one for whites. The Palestine and Wheatley Districts have only one high school each. In these districts when the Negro students reach the high school level they are transported to either Forrest City or Brinkley.

Saint Francis County is and has been making progress in the area of construction for the past ten years. However, the county has a high ratio of children under five years and a high crude birth rate. This indicates that there will be a large number of school age children for several years to come. This also means that school facilities will have to be expanded more if they are to adequately serve the young people who will make up the school population in the years to come.

The Three School Centers--The Eldridge Butler Elementary School is located in Madison, Arkansas. This little progressive town lies directly four miles east of Forrest City, Arkansas, which is the county seat. The entire population is 723.²

In the Eldridge Butler Elementary School, there are 8 teachers and 289 pupils.

¹Ibid., p. 93.

²Ibid.

The school was first established in 1950. It burned later and was replaced by a very modern building which was constructed in 1957. There are 8 classrooms, an attractive auditorium, which is built to serve as two classrooms. Each classroom has a small library. Lunch is served in the individual classrooms. The cafeteria-kitchen is modern and very attractive. The building also has an office with modern furniture and two sickrooms (clinics) one for boys and one for girls.

The Stewart Elementary School is located in Forrest City, Arkansas, which is 40 miles west of Memphis, Tennessee. It is the largest city in the county with a population of 10,611.¹

The Stewart Elementary School is a very modern plant, which was built in 1948. There are two separate buildings. One building houses the first three grades and the other houses the fourth, fifth and sixth grades. There are 19 teachers and 869 pupils in the Stewart Elementary School. There are 19 classrooms, an attractive library, a modern and attractive cafeteria, a music room, a modern office, two lounges, two sickrooms (one for boys and one for girls), and an audiovisual room.

The Christ Church School is located in Forrest City, Arkansas where its new site is adjacent to the Negro Community Center and Park. There are at present three modern new buildings.; the elementary school, the high school and the Headmaster's Cottage. There are eight classrooms, a cafeteria, and an office. The spacious playground affords adequate recreational opportunity for the children.

Method of research.--Descriptive-Survey Method of research using the specific techniques of the questionnaire, personal interview and observation, was used to collect the data requisite to the fulfillment of the

¹Ibid.

purposes of this study.

Description of the subjects.---The subjects involved in this study were approximately 40 teachers in grades one through twelve, cafeteria supervisors, principals and cafeteria managers of three selected schools of the Saint Francis County School District, Forrest City, Arkansas, 1964-1965.

Description of the instruments.---The instrument that was used to collect the data was a specifically designed questionnaire which identified the factors of the school and lunch program, such as: (a) questionnaires which were validated by my advisor, involved the following: (1) organization and administration of the school cafeteria program; (2) scope of the school cafeteria; (3) equipment placement and use; (4) sanitation; (5) records and personnel; (6) types of lunches and menu requirements; (6) pupil-teacher participation.

Method of procedure.---The procedural steps used in conducting this study were as follows:

1. Permission to conduct this study was secured from the proper school officials.
2. Pertinent literature related to the study was surveyed and presented in a summarized form in the finished thesis.
3. Visits were made to each of the schools under study to interview teachers, principals, and supervisors.
4. A questionnaire designed to study the organization and administration and the scope of the lunchroom program was constructed and validated under the direction of the advisors.
5. The philosophy, objectives, curricula and teaching methods of the three schools were studied.
6. The data was tabulated, analyzed and presented in appropriate form.

7. The findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations were presented in the finished thesis copy.

Criteria of reliability.--"The Criteria of Reliability" for appraising the data was the accuracy and authenticity of the responses of subjects to the items on the questionnaire which constituted the main source of the data.

Collection of data.--The collection of data was secured in the following manner:

1. Permission to conduct the study was secured from school officials.
2. The questionnaire on the organization, administration and scope of the school lunchroom program was distributed to and executed at the three schools.
3. Observations in the three school centers were made to get first-hand look at the problems involved in each situation, also to describe the existing school lunchroom facilities and services in the three selected schools in Saint Francis County, Arkansas.
4. Interviews were held with cafeteria supervisors, principals, cafeteria managers, teachers and pupils to get points of view and feelings.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Frame of reference.--The purpose of this chapter is to present a survey of the related literature which pertains to the problems of the school lunch program and school cafeteria services. The survey of the literature was organized around and presented here under the captions or categories:

1. Point-of-view authorities.
2. A description of the National School Lunch Program.
3. Trends in the School Market.
4. A brief history of the National School Lunch Program.

An analysis of the program and objectives of the school lunch program reveals that the schools are concerned with the development of the whole child and we should learn to feed our bodies just as we learn to read, to do simple sums and to take part in activities. Feeding our bodies should not be considered another "subject" to be taught but rather another way of integrating life processes with the total environment. The methods employed and the facts imparted should be irrefutable.

Not only are the food needs of the growing child greater than those at any other time in the human life span, but the quality of food is also more important during this period. The interests of the child as well as the facilities available in the school or to the school will determine how well and how much he can be taught about the feeding of his body.

Appetites formed at home with children during their pre-school years cannot be overlooked. They can and should be guided by the school keeping close cooperation with the home.

The school lunch program, in addition to its contribution to the individual and social aspects of the child's growth and development, provides experiences which will enable the child to understand better some of the basic economic problems in everyday life. A school truly concerned with the broader aspect of child growth and development will adjust its curriculum to make maximum use of the potentialities of every phase of the educational program, school lunch being a vital phase of the total program.¹

Points-of-view of authorities.--Martin points out certain contributions of food to school lunch programs.

1. To promote physical development and maintenance through a nutritionally adequate noon meal.
2. To promote educational basis and experiences for forming good food habits.
3. To promote social and emotional development of children.
4. To extend benefits to home and community.
5. To contribute to the nutritional well-being of children.

Lindsay states that the school dining room is a social laboratory.²

The school lunch program in addition to its contribution to the individual

¹Ethel A. Martin, Roberts Nutrition Work With Children (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 53.

²Southern States Work Conference on Educational Problems. "School Lunch Policies and Standards," (Tallahassee, Florida: Southern States Work Conference in Educational Problems, 1952), p. 3.

and social aspects of the child's growth and development, provides experiences which will enable the child to understand better some of the basic economic problems in everyday life. A school truly concerned with the broader aspects of child growth and development will adjust its curriculum to make maximum use of the potentialities of every phase of the educational program, school lunch being a vital phase of the total program.

Some objectives and learning experiences which would contribute to physical, mental, social and emotional development of children are:

1. To establish desirable food habits.
 - a. Discuss and observe new foods that are to be served in the meals
 - b. Eat daily as available, those foods set forth in the basic seven patterns
 - c. Help plan menus to be served at school
2. To acquire functional knowledge of nutrition, he may:
 - a. Participate in study of food needs of the community and help make plans for correcting deficiencies
 - b. Help prepare charts showing the food values of different meals
 - c. Participate in a survey of eating habits of children in his class
3. To acquire acceptable social practices, he may:
 - a. Plan for and entertain a guest at lunch at school
 - b. Practice handling tableware, going through serving line, being seated, seating girls and women teachers and returning dishes
 - c. Take turns as host and hostess at the table and in returning thanks
4. To learn good citizenship, he may: Practice democratic

procedures by serving on school lunch policy, and sharing in the benefits and responsibilities of the lunch period

5. To learn to appreciate aesthetic surroundings, he may help plan and carry out plans to give the school and the school dining room a pleasant, social and homelike atmosphere.

Several national groups have expressed the belief that all foods and beverages which are available in the school should be those which contribute to the nutritional needs of the child and which aid him in the development of desirable food habits. Candy, carbonated beverages and other penny snatchers should be kept out of the school.

The following reasons have been given by Rose¹ for dietary training in the elementary grades. The child at this period is approaching the years in which inculcation of the reasons for health habits and respect for laws of hygiene should be consistent part of his education, both home and at school. We strike at the root of physical unfitness when we began the teaching of food selection to all children, regardless to whether they appear under-nourished or not. What we want is to rear children who are intelligent as to the role which food plays in their lives, who are aware of their own responsibility in regard to food selection.

Neill Atkinson Bridges² made a study entitled, "Survey of Three Elementary School Lunch Programs in Fulton County, Georgia." Checklists, personnel observation and interviews were used to secure the desired data. The investigator sought to ascertain the status of personnel,

¹Mary Swartz Rose, The Foundation of Nutrition (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958), p. 42.

²Neill Atkinson Bridges, "A Survey of Three Elementary School Lunch Programs in Fulton County, Georgia." (unpublished Master's thesis, School of Education, Atlanta University, 1960), p. 44.

physical equipment, source of supplies, source of support, types of menus served, number of people served, and the educative values taught.

An analysis of the data led the writer to draw the following conclusions:

1. The lunchroom facilities were found to be adequate with the exception of a dishwashing machine found lacking in the two schools.
2. The data appear to warrant the conclusion that there is very little, if any, difference in the operation of the lunchroom program in the three schools.
3. The data appear to warrant the conclusion that a number of teachers lack sufficient knowledge and interest of the school lunch program.
4. The data appear to warrant the conclusion that a large number of pupils attend school daily without eating before coming or during the school day.
5. The data appear to warrant the conclusion that the three selected schools are not feeding 80 per cent of the total school enrollment, which is recognized as a national standard.

The second World War created a variety of problems related to food and nutrition, and directed attention to the fact that, for most people, the nutritional value of the foods they chose to eat was neither its most important aspect nor the reason for their choice.¹

By this time the science of nutrition had attained a considerable degree of precision, but did not include any systematic study of relevant human behavior. Food habits were regarded as "good" or "bad" depending on their contribution to nutritional well-being, and it was presumed that people would be ready to change their "bad" habits, if and when they were told how to do so.²

¹Anne Burgers, Malnutrition and Food Habits (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962), p. 50.

²Ibid.

The school lunch program is recognized as an integral part of education since it can make effective contributions to meeting the basic physical and educational needs of children. In view of the expansion of the school lunch programs and an increasing emphasis on planning school facilities for functional use, it is important that lunchrooms and food-service facilities in schools be planned in terms of local needs and in terms of an accepted program for these facilities.¹

Within recent years, the school cafeteria has claimed the attention of those who advocate improved physical surroundings in the modern school. This fact is evidenced in the work of many writers. Battle emphasizes the fact that:

The physical characteristics of the room where the children gather must not be overlooked if it is to fulfill its function, its atmosphere, its equipment, and provision of a cultural background. That is, it should encourage social values - consideration of others, better taste, better manners, ability to converse with fellow students, and ability to relax and eat leisurely.²

West and Wood state that:

The efficacy of any good food service unit is largely dependent upon the plant in which it is housed, and such architectural features as building material, construction, the kind of floors, walls, and ceilings should be considered in planning a new building or selecting an old one already built.

The cafeteria's function of food service is specific and it is planned and equipped with this in mind, yet it may contribute to the social training and development of students and to the cultivation of appreciation for beauty which is of fundamental importance to the full

¹Lloyd White, Guide for Planning School Plants (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), pp. 136-137.

²Lucretia F. Battle, "Proper Setting Stimulates Interest in the Noon Meal," Nations School, XIV (September, 1954), p. 58.

development of all individuals. In the accomplishment of both its specific and general functions, utility and beauty may be combined. The architectural features and furnishings which make of the cafeteria an attractive and comfortable room also enhance its usefulness.¹

West and Wood further point up the fact:

That the cafeteria is preferably located on the ground floor and that the school lunchrooms are preferably located on the first floor of the school building, as convenient as possible to the main hallway and locker rooms. The location should be such that in the absence of an adequate ventilation system, objectionable odors which might lessen the appeal of food to the students and prove a nuisance to classes will be eliminated. The cafeteria plant should be quiet, simple, and attractive, well ventilated, well lighted and scrupulously clean.²

A General Description of The National School Lunch Program.--The

National School Lunch Program is operated under Public Law 396, 79th Congress, as amended, and is a grant-in-aid program of federal assistance to the states. The United States Department of Agriculture administers the program nationally, but the State educational agencies have the responsibility of administering the program within their respective areas, except in States which are not permitted by State law to administer the program in nonprofit private schools. In these States the USDA administers the nonprofit private school program through five area offices of the Food Distribution Division.

The State Agencies take agreements with local boards of education governing the operation of lunch programs in schools under their jurisdiction. As a means of assisting schools to meet the program requirements, schools participating in the National School Lunch Program are

¹Ibid., p. 59.

²Ibid., p. 60.

reimbursed for a portion of their food costs by the Federal government and also receive surplus foods and certain other foods purchased specifically for their use.

Section 4 of the National School Lunch Act initially prescribed that the apportionment of funds among the States "Shall be made on the basis of two factors: (1) The number of school children in the State and (2) the need for assistance in the State as indicated by the relation of the per capita income in the United States to the per capita income in the State." The higher the per capita income, the less a State would receive on a per child basis.

The 87th Congress amended Section 4 of the National School Lunch Act thus providing the first major amendment to the Act since its passage in 1946. It provides that the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States and Territories be changed from a basis of school age population and relative need to a basis of actual participation in the program and relative need. To preclude any large changes in the amount of funds that any State will receive, a three-year transitional period is provided for in the amendment. During the first year of the transitional period (FY 1963), 75 per cent of the funds were apportioned under the old formula and 25 per cent under the new formula. During the second year (FY 1964), 50 per cent will be apportioned under the old and 50 per cent under the new. During the third year (FY 1965), 25 per cent will be apportioned under the old and 75 per cent under the new. After that, only the new formula will be used.

Section 7 of the Act sets forth the requirements which must be met concerning the matching of Federal funds from sources within the State.

Federal payments to the States shall be made upon condition that each dollar will be so matched by three dollars. In the case of any State whose per capita income is less than the per capita income of the United States, the matching required for any fiscal year shall be decreased by the percentage which the State's per capita income is below the per capita income of the United States.¹

Under the National School Lunch Program, any nonprofit public or private school of high school grade or under as defined in the statutes of the State, is eligible to participate. Schools participating in the National School Lunch Program agree: to operate the school lunch program on a nonprofit basis; serve lunches which meet the nutritional requirements as set forth in the School Lunch Regulations; serve lunches free or at a reduced price to all children who are determined by local school authorities to be unable to pay the full price; make no discrimination against any child because of his inability to pay; keep accurate records of all transactions; keep records available for review or audit; maintain proper facilities and storage; and accept and use such foods as may be offered as a donation from the Department.

As stated above, each school must agree to serve lunches which meet the nutritional requirements as set forth in program regulations. These nutritional requirements are expressed in terms of five broad food groups that make up a well-balanced lunch. These groups are: Protein-rich foods, vegetables and fruits, bread, butter and milk. When the foods

¹Agricultural Marketing Service, "A General Description of the National School Lunch Program," United States Department of Agriculture (Washington, May, 1964), p. 9.

from these five categories (Type A pattern) are used in the amounts specified in the regulations and in combination with other foods needed to prepare certain dishes and to satisfy young appetites, the lunches meet from one-third or one-half of the daily dietary allowances recommended for children 10- to 12-years old by the National Academy of Sciences--National Research Council. A Type A lunch shall contain as a minimum:

1. One-half pint of fluid whole milk as a beverage
2. Two ounces (edible portion as served) of lean meat, poultry or fish or two ounces of cheese; or one egg or one-half cup of cooked dry beans or peas; or four tablespoons of peanut butter; or an equivalent quantity of any combination of the above listed foods. To be counted in meeting this requirement, these foods must be served in a main dish or in a main dish and one other menu item.
3. A three-fourth cup serving consisting of two or more vegetables or fruits or both. Full-strength vegetable or fruit juice may be counted to meet not more than one-fourth cup of this requirement.
4. One slice of whole-grain or enriched bread; or a serving of cornbread, biscuits, rolls, muffins, etc., made of whole-grain or enriched meal or flour.
5. Two teaspoons of butter or fortified margarine.

Thus, by following these standards, each participating school is able to develop menus that are adapted both to local food preferences and to local food supplies. At the same time nutritional balance is assured.¹

The authority for the distribution of agricultural commodities to the school lunch program is derived from three sources: Section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended; Section 32 (surplus removal) Agricultural Adjustment Act of August 24, 1935, as amended; and Section 416 (price support) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

¹Ibid., p. 2.

Section 6 of the Act authorized the Department to make direct purchases of commodities to be distributed only among the States and schools participating in the National School Lunch Program. These foods provide a valuable contribution to the nutritional adequacy of the lunches. Under this authority the Department may purchase such frozen foods as ground beef and chickens and such canned items as apricots, green beans, cherries, corn, peaches, peas and tomatoes.

Section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935 provides a permanent annual appropriation to the Department for the general purpose of expanding domestic and foreign markets for agricultural commodities. One method of achieving this goal is through direct purchases of commodities determined by the Department to be in such surplus supply that direct government assistance is necessary to avoid acute distress to producers. Commodities acquired under such a purchase program may be donated to nonprofit school lunch programs and to needy groups within this country.

Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, is concerned with commodities that have been acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program. It provides that if such commodities cannot be disposed of in normal domestic channels without impairment of the price support program or sold abroad at competitive world prices, they may be donated to nonprofit school lunch programs and other eligible recipients.¹

Trends in the school-market for food.--The nation's schools provide an important rapidly expanding market for food. During the school year

¹Ibid., p. 3.

1962-63, foods with a wholesale value of \$929 million moved through lunchrooms in about 66,000 public elementary and secondary schools. Additional foods valued at \$77 million were used in approximately 6,500 private schools offering food services. The school outlet therefore, accounts for about \$1 billion in foods.¹

Five years earlier, public school lunchrooms were providing an outlet for foods valued at \$597 million; thus there has been a gain of \$332 million or 56 per cent over levels in 1957-58. Wholesale food prices raise about 6 per cent during this five year period; hence, the increase was largely in the volume of food moving through this market.

Expansion of the school food market resulted primarily from larger school enrollment and increase availability of school lunch services. In 1957-58 slightly over 21 million public school children had nearly 28.5 million. In private schools the number of pupils having lunches available increased by 400,000.²

Most of the expansion in lunch service availability and the attendant increased use of food occurred within the framework of the National School Lunch Program. During 1962-63 approximately 64 per cent of the nation's 112,000 public and private schools representing 75 per cent of United States student enrollment, participated in the Federal program received cash and commodity donations to help them serve well-balanced lunches at less than full cost. The school outlet is one means

¹Martin Kriesberg, Agricultural Economist, "Trends in the School Market for Food," Economic Research Service, (Washington, D. C. August, 1964), p. 33.

²Ibid., p. 34.

of utilizing commodities acquired by the Government through price stabilization and surplus removal programs. Children participating in lunch programs are exposed to new foods in new forms, learning at the same time the idea of a well-balanced lunch and the importance of good eating habits.¹

A brief history of the school lunch program.--How did this program -- the feeding of children at school -- get started? Actually, there is no specific date that we can give as the birthday of the School Feeding Program. It developed slowly, at various places and for various reasons. In come respects, the movement to make provision for the service of lunches at schools is like Topsy, "it just grewed up".

The problem of feeding school children is as old as our schools themselves. This problem was first solved by the children bringing their lunches with them if they could not go home at noon to eat. And for years the problem was solved in this way. Even today, far too many schools, solve the problem in the same way -- go home to lunch or bring it with you. But worse than this, another alternative has evolved and that is the hamburger joint near the school campus. There is no reason to enumerate the many evils of hamburger joints.

In the early days of the American Republic, we find evidence that in many isolated cases, ambitious, dedicated teachers who were concerned about the health and well-being of their students saw to it that a HOT DISH, usually soup or stew, was provided for their children at noon.

¹Ibid., p. 36.

As our cities developed, and as education became more popular--not for the rich alone--problems arose concerning the noon-day meal for the children that attended school. For various reasons some of the children who could not go home for lunch could not, or did not, bring a lunch with them. So, in some of our cities, we find that peddlers of various kinds of food items began to appear--forerunners of the hamburger joints already mentioned.

Although we can assume that individual, isolated efforts to supply children with a lunch of sorts at school had existed at some time and in some places since the beginning of organized school systems, it is only in the past 100 years or so that we see outlines of conscious attempt to meet at least part of a child's daily food requirements at school.

During the days when ours could be called a frontier nation, and on into a time well within the memory of many of us present, the life of each family was based on a self-contained economy. Most of the food eaten was produced at home; each family had its own milk cow; bakeries were few and small because they were patronized only in times of emergency. And this self sufficiency of the family was not limited to food alone; it extended to all areas. Why, it has been only a short time ago that a friend of mine, who is, by the way, a teacher here in the Tyler schools, explained why she was a year late finishing high school. The year that she reached the legal age for attending school she couldn't go because there wasn't room for her in the buggy. No thought of school busses for that family! As a matter of course the youngest stayed home until the oldest finished school and made room for her in the buggy. But, I am confident that no matter how crowded, there was a place in

the buggy for well-filled lunch-pails.

There is another factor in the development of the school lunch program in small towns that has received little attention, but I believe that it is an important one. And that is the attitude of society toward eating away from home. Prior to World War I, few women voluntarily sought employment outside the home and the highest compliment that a woman could receive was to be called "a good housekeeper". Men were expected to be "good providers" and their wives were expected to "set a good table". The preparation of three meals a day, every day, was as inevitable as death and taxes, and a family ate away from home only on the very infrequent trips taken by the average family in those days. For a family to have eaten out at any other time would have implied that the mother was a lazy or shiftless person.

With such an attitude it was inevitable that mothers should take pride in "packing a good lunch" for their children to take to school. And who is to say that a certain amount of rivalry did not exist among some mothers in preparing lunches for their children?

Unfortunately, in the slum areas of our cities, mothers were not financially able to indulge in such pride and it is in New York City that we find a record of the first organized school feeding operation in the United States when, in 1853, the Children's Aid Society of New York opened the first of its vocational schools for the poor and served meals to all who attended. In 1894, the Star Center Association of Philadelphia organized municipal school feeding in elementary schools.

Prior to this time, France had provided for the operation of some school lunch programs and was the first country to provide for school

lunches on a National scale. In England, in 1904, Parliament authorized local school authorities to install facilities for preparing and serving food as part of the standard school equipment.

Two books, Poverty, written by Robert Hunter in 1904, and Underfed School Children, the Problem and the Remedy, written by John Spargo in 1906, called attention to the fact that an estimated several million children in the United States were undernourished. They pointed out how other countries had attacked their problems of malnutrition by a program of school feeding and advocated a similar program for the United States.

School officials also began to recognize that malnutrition affected the ability of the child to learn at school and to agree with Robert Hunter when he said:

"It is utter folly, from the point of view of learning, to have a compulsory school law which compels children, in that weak physical and mental state which results from poverty, to drag themselves to school and sit at their desks, day in and day out, for several years, learning little or nothing. . . .

If it is a matter of principle in democratic America that every child shall be given a certain amount of instruction, let us render it possible for them to receive it. . . ."

This recognition gave a quick impetus to the school lunch program, so, that by 1910, many cities were operating penny-lunch programs in elementary schools. In these schools small portions of food--a bowl of soup, bread and butter, or cocoa for example--were sold for 1 to 3 cents during noon recess. Most of these lunches were self supporting and encouraged children to use their lunch money to buy nourishing food.

In 1918 the Bureau of Municipal Research made a survey in 86 cities which revealed that there was some provision for lunches in high schools in 76 per cent of the cities, but that there was provision for lunches in only 25 per cent of the elementary schools. The reasons for the difference were given as time and distance. Elementary school children lived within walking distance of school while high school students came from widely scattered points.

It is significant that only five of the high schools with lunch programs indicated that they had been established to combat malnutrition--in the other high schools the lunch program was simply a convenient accessory to the school system.

But thus far, we have only considered the cities--what of the small towns and rural areas? In the small towns, where time and distance were not factors, children went home to lunch, but in the rural areas considerable interest was shown in school lunches between 1900 and 1920. A widely used arrangement was one by which the children contributed food for one hot dish to be prepared by the teacher as a supplement to the cold lunch brought from home. To provide a simple inexpensive arrangement that would meet the essentials of sanitation and nourishment called for and got a great deal of ingenuity on the part of teachers, parents and school officials.

It was during these years that schools began to link the school lunch with education in nutrition. Publications stressed the importance of teaching children to drink milk. The Department of Agriculture prepared charts for schools that showed the elements of a balanced, wholesome lunch.

But it was the depression of the 1930's that provided the impetus

that firmly established lunches in our schools. While many teachers were using their own money to feed children who came to school hungry, organizations like the American Red Cross and the American Friends Service Committee undertook to feed children in some communities. State and local governments passed legislation to encourage lunch programs and many of them made appropriations for that purpose. By 1937, fifteen states had passed laws authorizing school boards to operate lunchrooms. The laws usually proposed serving of meals at the cost of the food, but four states made provisions for needy children.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation made loans in 1932 and 1933 to several towns to pay people for preparing and serving school lunches. This work was expanded during the next two years under the Civil Works Administration and the Federal Emergency Relief Administration.

In 1935, when the Works Progress Administration, or W. P. A. as it was better known, was created, school lunch work became a permanent phase of their operation. Funds were provided to employ cooks and servers in schools throughout the United States and in Puerto Rico.

As early as 1932, surplus foods were distributed on a limited basis for free lunches, and the development of agricultural policies and legislation making surplus agricultural commodities available to schools has served as a major incentive to the school lunch program.

In 1935, legislation provided a permanent annual appropriation to the Department of Agriculture which enabled the Department to institute a direct purchase and distribution program to help farmers solve the problems of surplus commodities. The nonprofit school lunch program shared in the reception of these commodities.

In 1939, the Department announced a special program to expand school lunch feeding through the use of surplus foods distributed on the basis of the number of needy children served. But, gradually, the initial relief aspect of the program blended into one with the two-fold objective of improving the health of children and encouraging the increased consumption of agricultural commodities.

The cash reimbursement program to pay for a part of the food purchased locally for schools was begun in the spring of 1943. And in 1944, Congress for the first time, authorized a specific amount of money for the operation of the school lunch and penny milk programs, and provided that such activities could be carried out without regard to the existence of a surplus.

Not until 1945 did the Congress, in legislation appropriating funds for school lunch, spell out for the first time the conditions under which assistance would be provided. This legislation provided the cornerstone on which was built the National School Lunch Act which was enacted in 1946 and which is the basic authority for the present National School Lunch Program as it exists today.

Up to this point, this has been largely a chronological account of the development of the legal aspects of the National School Lunch Program. To leave the subject there would be a grave injustice to the thousands of sincere people who have made the program what it is today-- a program that is often referred to as the single most effective force for good nutrition in the nation.

The prototype of the present Type A pattern for school lunches was established back in 1916 in a farmer's bulletin issued by the USDA that

said each school lunch should include selections from the following food groups:

1. Milk, supplemented by other protein-rich and fatty foods
2. Starchy foods
3. Vegetables and fruits
4. Simple sweets

Yes, the prototype was there, but nutritionists were not satisfied to leave it there. They have brought the Type A lunch to where it is today-- a recognized part of our educational system. In 1960, approximately 13 million children are participating in the National School Lunch Program, and the number increases yearly.

It is only natural that any program that has developed and grown as rapidly as has school lunch should have its problems. The chief problem is having to compete for time with teaching and administrative responsibilities of longer standing. We must admit that in many schools the lunch program still exists as a restaurant service quite unrelated to education.

Yet, if we are to attain the long term goal of the lunch program, namely improved physical and social well-being through good nutrition, the program must be given recognition in the school curriculum and there must be a time in the school day when teachers give planned direction to the thinking of children to a practical application of a knowledge of nutrition in the lunch situation. I challenge you here today to exercise your knowledge and to use all the tact you possess to make this goal an established fact in your own school system.

On every hand we hear that ours is a changing society and that

Americans are on the move. No longer is it a reflection on the ability of a homemaker for her family to eat out. Indeed we are told by our friends in the restaurant business that "eating out is fun". Certainly, children have more money to spend today than we had when we were young--and more places to spend it. It is, therefore, up to you to make your Type A lunches so attractive and so downright good that they will be preferred to the less nutritious foods usually sold at the corner store or hamburger joints.

Finally, let me impress upon you that at a time when others are emphasizing science, mathematics, and foreign languages as security measures, it is our job to see to it that our first line of defense, the physical well-being of the nation's children, is not neglected because there is "no room for it in the buggy". Let's put it in the buggy and keep it there by making our lunch program an integral part of our schools.¹

¹Charles Hicks, "The History of the School Lunch," School Lunch Division, Arkansas State Department of Education (Little Rock: 1965), pp. 1-7.

CHAPTER III

ORGANIZATION AND TREATMENT OF DATA

Prefatory statement.---In this chapter the data derived from the questionnaire, interviews, and observations have been organized and are presented under the following captions: (a) History of the School Lunch Program in Saint Francis County, Arkansas; (b) Curricula in the Three Schools; (c) Standards of Lunch programs, and (d) the tabulations of data on facets of the program as set forth in the following tables are listed immediately below.

1. Table 1 - Showing Average Number of Pupils Buying, Bringing and Eating Free Lunch in the Three School Lunch Programs.
2. Table 2 - Data Showing Devices Used to Stimulate Participation in the Three Lunch Room Programs and the Number of Teachers Using Them.
3. Table 3 - Data Showing Source of Income For Labor, Food and Equipment in the Three School Lunch Programs.
4. Table 4 - Data Showing Enumeration of Lunch Room Equipment in the Three Schools.
5. Table 5 - Data Showing the Educational Status of the Lunchroom Personnel in the Three Schools.
6. Table 6 - Data Showing the Personnel and the Types of Markets in the Purchase of Foods for the Cafeterias

of the Three Schools.

7. Table 7 - Data Showing Pay Periods of Lunchroom Personnel.

8. Table 8 - Data Showing the Income Received from Sale of Lunches and Expenditures for Labor Per Week.

A brief history of the school lunch program in Saint Francis County school system.--Saint Francis County does not have a written record of its school lunch program. However, for many years it was the custom for the school children of this county to take lunches to school in buckets or brown pack sacks.

In 1935, the Works Project Administration began to pay workers for preparing meals for the school children. Also the Department of Agriculture began the purchase and distribution of surplus agricultural commodities. This program enabled the schools of this county which found it convenient to have a lunch corner to have free labor to help prepare the hot lunch. Many schools had parents to give their services to help prepare and serve the hot lunch.

The Parent-Teacher Association, social clubs and other community agencies raised funds for the kitchen equipment.

The menu was planned by a committee usually composed of the principal, a parent and a W. P. A. worker. The menu was not an "A" type lunch, but all of the pupils were given something hot to eat at noon.

It was more than ten years after Congress passed Public Law 320, which authorized the use of funds to buy surplus commodities that a School Lunchroom Supervisor was hired. Previous to this time the school lunch program was the responsibility of the Home Economics teachers and

in many schools the principal had to manage the program.¹

Curricula in the three selected schools.--In each of the schools studied the children are encouraged to participate in making their own daily lesson plans. More emphasis was placed on wide free use of books than on textbook type of teaching. The students were grouped in small numbers according to their own interest. Both the physical and emotional quality of the environment in which the child and teacher live during the school day were found to be conditions for most effective learning. The curriculum is one that is built around the needs, interests, and abilities of the students it is responsible for educating.

The principal and teachers of the three schools formulated a philosophy and certain general objectives. According to the questionnaire submitted by the principal to the teachers of the three selected schools the teachers believe:

1. That their responsibility is to take the children of the community as we find them... Train them, refine and inspire them to become useful, happy and successful citizens in our democracy.
2. That the school should provide a friendly, wholesome atmosphere conducive to effective living and learning.
3. That through continued cooperation of the community, teachers and pupils, we must provide for well-roundedness through mental, physical, social, emotion, spiritual, and cultural development of each child.
4. That the foundation of good citizenship and genuine leadership must be laid in the school as well as in the home and the church.

¹Information obtained by interview with Mr. W. A. Armstrong, Saint Francis County School Supervisor, May 27, 1965.

5. That the essential needs of every student are proper instruction and guidance which will serve best for his individuality.
6. That in order to administer to the individual needs of each student the teachers must have an insight into the problems of each student and by working together as a whole it can provide the vital elements essential for a favorable solution to them.¹

Objectives of individual schools.--The specific objectives of the individual schools as worked out by the faculties and principals are listed below:

Stewart Memorial Elementary -- To develop a program that serves the needs of the youth for whom it is responsible. To strive for a better school-home relationship. To give each child a feeling of belonging. And to provide experiences for each pupil to acquire skills, knowledge, attitudes, habits, understandings, appreciations, and values which are necessary for full participation in our way of life.²

Eldridge Butler Elementary School -- To raise the standard of our school community. To give the child a real sense of belonging. To show the importance of higher education. To organize an effective program to meet the immediate needs of our children and community. And to strive for a better school-home relationship.³

Christ Church School -- To train the whole child... His mind to think, to plan, and to evaluate. To train his hands to work skillfully and earnestly, and his heart to be loyal and true to God, and to his fellowman.⁴

Standards for an effective school lunch program.--The success of any lunchroom program hinges upon the interest, status and training of its manager. The person in charge should be qualified both by nature and by

¹Statements taken from the questionnaires submitted to the principals of the three schools in the study.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

training, or the whole venture is likely to defeat its own purpose.

There are certain fundamental qualities which each lunchroom manager should possess. Hart advocated that a good lunchroom manager should possess the following characteristics:

1. She should be tactful.
2. She must have a knowledge and understanding of the emotional and economic background of her employees.
3. She must be highly imaginative, energetic, forceful and courteous.
4. She must be accessible to and respected by those with whom she works.
5. She must be enthusiastic and interested in her work.
6. She must be eager to improve conditions, and willing to solicit the cooperation of all teachers in the school.
7. The manager must put forth every effort to stimulate each individual with whom she works.
8. The manager must help set up standards leading to perfection in the process at which they are working.¹

According to the standards set up by the Arkansas State Department of Education² a school lunch program must meet the following requirements:

1. There must be a person directly responsible for the administration and operation of the cafeteria program in each school.
2. The program should provide for an in-service training program.
3. The building should allow 10 to 12 feet per seat for each pupil.

¹Constance C. Hart, "Training of Personnel in Standards," Journal of American Dietetics Association, XV (November, 1949), pp. 740-41.

4. The building should be planned to seat 40 per cent of the total enrollment.
5. The building must be located so as to provide optimum natural light and good cross ventilation.
6. The building should be located to avoid school lunch noises and odors being transmitted to other areas of the school plant.
7. The school plant should be located to provide for waiting lines (preferably contained within the dining space) in order to minimize admission of insects.
8. The school cafeteria should be accessible to public without opening the entire building.
9. Windows should be screened with durable, non-rust materials and removable for window washing.
10. The dining walls should be washable for 4 to 6 feet from the floor.
11. The kitchen walls should be washable and light in color.
12. Physical examinations should be required for school lunch personnel.
13. The lunchroom should be inspected, regularly by the Department of Public Health.
14. The school should be feeding 80 per cent or more of its total enrollment.
15. Pasteurized milk should be provided for every child daily.
16. Free meals should be given to children who need them.
17. Twenty minutes or more should be allowed for children to eat lunch, exclusive of time consumed in washing hands and standing in line.
18. The plant must be 750 square feet, which is the minimum size.
19. The store room should be approximately one-third the size of the kitchen.
20. The store room shelves should be placed away from the

wall far enough to allow air circulation. A 2" air space is recommended.

21. Hoods and exhaust fans over cooking equipment are necessary to eliminate grease vapors and steam.
22. Refrigerators, ranges, ovens and steam equipment should be placed away from walls to allow cleaning.
23. A lounge with locker, and toilet facilities for employees should be provided, also enough space should be provided for one or two chairs, dressing table and mirror, and a first aid cabinet.¹

Participation in lunchroom program.--The data presented in Table 1, page 44, reveal that of the 888 pupils enrolled in the Stewart Elementary School, 661 or 75.5 per cent buy lunch daily. Whereas, 212 or 23.9 per cent bring sack lunches. The data further indicate that 15 or 1.7 per cent are eating free lunches. The average number of pupils eating daily at the Stewart School is 676 or 77.4 per cent. The table further shows that of the 297 pupils enrolled at the Eldridge Butler Elementary School, 189 or 63.7 per cent buy lunches daily. Whereas, 100 or 33.6 per cent bring sack lunches. The data further indicate that 8 or 2.7 per cent of these pupils are eating free lunches. There is a total of 197 or 66.3 per cent of these pupils eating daily. Of the 163 pupils enrolled in the Christ Church School, 148 or 90.1 per cent buy lunches daily. Whereas, 5 or 3.1 per cent bring sack lunches. The table further shows that 10 or 6.1 per cent eat free lunches. There is a total of 158 or 96.9 per cent of the Christ Church pupils eating daily which is the greatest percentage of pupils eating daily in the three selected schools.

¹Arkansas State Department of Education, "Planning School Lunch Departments," School Lunch Division, (Little Rock, 1960), Circular 4.105.

TABLE 1

DATA SHOWING AVERAGE NUMBER OF PUPILS BUYING, BRINGING AND EATING
FREE LUNCH IN THE THREE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

School	Total Enrollment	Buying Lunch Daily		Bringing Lunch Daily		Eating Free Daily		Total Number Eating Daily	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Stewart	888	661	75.5	212	23.9	15	1.7	676	77.4
Eldridge									
Butler	297	189	63.6	100	33.6	8	2.7	197	66.3
Christ									
Church	163	148	90.1	5	3.1	10	6.1	158	96.9

Type of lunch served.--In two of the schools studied, no special instrument was used to measure the amount of food served to the children. One of the schools used an ice cream dipper in order to serve equal portions. However, it was evident that the quantity of food served, according to Type "A" lunch provided by each school, was sufficient to meet the recommended requirement for the type lunch served.

A typical menu served in the three schools for a week is as follows:

1. Monday--Ground Beef and spaghetti, Turnips and greens, Buttered corn, Carrot sticks, Hot rolls, Peanut butter date balls and Milk.
2. Tuesday--Scalloped Ham and Potato Cheese Casserole, Field peas, Tossed salad with boiled eggs, Hot rolls, Jello with fruit and Milk.
3. Wednesday--Turkey and dressing, Green beans, Buttered carrots, Fruit salad with orange juice, Hot rolls and Milk.
4. Thursday--Hamburgers with onion-pickle mustard, Cheese slices, Potato salad, Peach cobbler and Milk.
5. Friday--Dried beans, Buttered cabbage, Carrot-raisin salad, Apple sauce, Hot rolls and Milk.

Devices used to stimulate lunchroom participation.--Table 2, page 46, shows that a majority of teachers at the Stewart School used a number of devices to stimulate lunchroom participation. Of the 19 teachers at the Stewart School, it is indicated that all 19 of them used food posters and lunch menus to stimulate lunchroom participation. Whereas, 14 teachers used reading materials while 16 of them transmitted dietary information to parents and 10 of them made home visitations. Of the 8 teachers at the Eledridge Butler School, 7 of them used lunchroom menus to stimulate participation, whereas, 5 teachers used reading material, while 7 used food posters and only 4 teachers transmitted dietary information to parents.

TABLE 2

DEVICES USED TO STIMULATE PARTICIPATION IN THE THREE LUNCHROOM PROGRAMS AND THE
NUMBER OF TEACHERS USING THEM

School	Stimulation of Lunch Program Within School				Transmitting of Dietary Information to Pupils and Parents		
	Number of Teachers	Reading Materials	Food Posters	Lunch Menus	Parents Contacted	Home Visi- tation by Teachers	Lunch Menus
Stewart							
Memorial	19	14	19	19	16	10	19
Eldridge							
Butler	8	5	7	7	4	4	5
Christ							
Church	8	5	7	3	5	1	3

Of the three schools, Christ Church uses the smallest number of devices to stimulate lunchroom participation. Of the 8 teachers at the Christ Church School, only one makes home visitation, 7 used food posters, 5 used reading materials and parent contact.

Source of income for labor, food and equipment.--Table 3, page 48, shows that all the schools receive income from sales of lunches to be used for labor, food, and equipment. The table further reveals that the Stewart and Eldridge Butler Schools receive money from the school board. The table also shows that only the Christ Church School received aid from the Parent-Teacher Association for labor, food, and equipment.

Types of lunchroom equipment.--Table 4, page 49, presents the data on the types of lunchroom equipment provided in the cafeterias of the three selected schools in Saint Francis County, Arkansas.

The data presented in Table 4 reveal that the Christ Church School is in need of a stack oven. Butler and Christ Church Schools are in need of dishwashing machines. All three schools are without a meat slicer, and the Butler School is in need of a centralized dining area.

The seating capacity for the Stewart School is 120, whereas, the seating capacity for the Christ Church School is 140 and the Butler School's seating is 297 which indicates that this school uses their individual classrooms for eating lunch.

Educational status of the Lunchroom personnel.--Table 5, page 50, reveals the data on the educational status of the members of the personnel employed in the three schools in Saint Francis County, Arkansas, with the significant facts characterized below.

Stewart School has six lunchroom workers. They are full-time

TABLE 3

SOURCE OF INCOME FOR LABOR, FOOD AND EQUIPMENT IN THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

School	Labor			Food			Equipment		
	Sales of Lunches	P T A	Other Agencies	Sale of Lunches	P T A	Other Agencies	Sale of Lunches	P T A	School Board
Stewart									
Memorial	X			X			X		X
Eldridge									
Butler	X			X			X		X
Christ									
Church	X	X		X	X		X	X	

TABLE 4

TYPES OF LUNCH-ROOM EQUIPMENT IN THE THREE SCHOOLS

Applicance and Equipment	Schools			Total
	Stewart Memorial	Eldridge Butler	Christ Church	
Range	1	2	3	6
Stack Oven	1	1	0	2
Refrigerator	1	1	1	3
Freezing Unit	1	1	1	3
Service Counter	1	3	1	5
Dish Washing Machine	1	0	0	1
Sink	2	2	2	6
Potato Peeler	0	0	0	0
Food Mixer	1	1	1	3
Meat Slicer	0	0	0	0
Seating Capacity	120	297 ^a	140	557

^aUse classrooms

workers. The Butler School has the equivalent of one and one-half lunch-room workers. The janitor serves as a part-time worker. The Christ Church School has the equivalent of three and one-half workers. The Home Economics teacher serves as lunchroom manager at the Christ Church School.

The years of training of the personnel ranged from the eighth grade

TABLE 5

EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF THE LUNCHROOM PERSONNEL IN
THE THREE SCHOOLS

School	Number of Workers	College				High School				Elementary			
		Number of Years				Number of Years				Number of Years			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Stewart	6 ^a				1	2	1	1					1
Butler	1½ ^a					1							
Christ	3 ^b				1	1							1

^aThe same supervisor serves both Butler and Stewart Schools.
The Janitor at the Butler School helps with the manual labor.

^bThe Home Economics teacher serves as lunchroom manager at the
Christ Church School.

All schools use student help.

to four years of college. However, 60 per cent of the personnel in the
three schools had training at the high school level.

Further investigation revealed that none of the workers is given
an opportunity to participate in in-service training.

Personnel and the types of markets involved in the purchase of
foods.--Table 6, page 51, presents the data on the personnel and type of
markets involved in the purchase of foods for the three schools in Saint
Francis County, Arkansas.

According to the tabulated data, the three schools do not have a
central purchasing agent. The data indicate that the three schools

TABLE 6

THE PERSONNEL AND THE TYPES OF MARKETS INVOLVED IN THE PURCHASE
OF FOODS FOR THE CAFETERIAS OF THE THREE SCHOOLS

School	Purchases Made		Place of Purchase		
	Principal	Manager	Local Store	Farmer's Market	Wholesale House
Stewart		X	X	X	X
Butler		X	X	X	X
Christ	X	X	X	X	X

purchase foods from local stores, farmer's markets and from wholesale houses. Such a practice does not contribute to economy in buying. Careful buying is a prime factor in the operation of the school lunch program. In each of the three schools there is a lunchroom manager who purchases the supplies for the program.

Pay periods and aggregate pay of lunchroom personnel.--Table 7, page 52, reveals data concerning the pay periods of lunchroom workers in the three selected schools in Saint Francis County, Arkansas.

The data revealed that the Stewart School has six workers who receive a total payment of \$520.00 per month. The table also shows that the Butler School has one worker receiving a total payment of \$120.00

TABLE 7

PAY PERIODS AND AGGREGATE PAY OF LUNCHROOM PERSONNEL

School	Number of Workers	Personnel			Schedule of Pay		Total Per Month
		Manager	Helpers	Dish Washers	Bi Weekly	Bi Weekly	
Stewart ^a	6	X	X			X	\$520.00
Butler ^a	1	X	1 ^b			X	\$120.00
Christ	3	X	X	X	X		\$230.00

^aThe supervisor's salary for Stewart and Butler Schools is not listed here.

^bThe janitor's salary is not listed here.

per month. The janitor serves as a part-time worker at the Butler School. The data further shows that the Christ Church School has three workers who received a total payment of \$230.00 per month. The Stewart and Butler School personnel are paid every two weeks and the Christ Church personnel are paid every week. Two of the schools, Butler and the Stewart Schools did not indicate any pay for dishwashing.

Income received from sale of lunches and expenditures for labor.--

Table 8, page 53, presents data concerning the income received from the sale of lunches and the total expenditures for labor in the three selected schools in Saint Francis County, Arkansas.

The data revealed that Stewart School with a total number of 661 lunches sold at 25 cents per meal receives the total amount of \$826.25 for meals sold; whereas, the expenditures for labor are only \$155.00. The Butler School with a total number of 189 lunches sold at 25 cents per

TABLE 8

INCOME RECEIVED FROM THE SALE OF LUNCHES AND EXPENDITURES FOR LABOR PER WEEK

School	Total Number Sold		Total Money Received	Expenditures for Labor Per Week, Amount and Number Paid			Total Expenditures
	.25	.15		30.00	25.00	12.50	
Stewart	661		\$ 826.25	1	5	0	\$ 155.00
Butler	189		236.26	1	0	0	30.00
Christ Church	8	140	115.00	1	1	1	67.50

meal received the total amount of \$236.26 for meals sold. The Butler School only spends \$30.00 for personnel salary. The data further indicate that the Christ Church School with a total number of 148 lunches sold at 15 and 25 cents per meal received the total amount of \$115.00 for lunches sold. The expenditures for the Christ Church School was \$67.50.

Table 8 further shows that all three schools studied sell more than enough lunches to pay for labor.

Summary of the basic findings.---The summary of the basic findings presented in this chapter are outlined in the paragraphs to follow.

1. Educational opportunities.---The educational opportunities were found to be as follows:
 - a. Many factors and qualities can be used in the lunchroom program that can be correlated with other subjects to enrich the educational program.
 - b. The lunch program serves to raise home standards of food and hygiene.
 - c. The school lunch program trains the child in social habits.
2. Lunchroom participation.---The study revealed:
 - a. That 80 per cent of the pupils were eating lunch daily.
 - b. Only 20 per cent of the pupils were bringing sack lunches.
3. Devices used to stimulate lunchroom participation:---The study revealed:
 - a. Sixty-eight per cent of the teachers used reading materials.
 - b. Ninety-four per cent of the teachers used food posters.
 - c. The majority of the teachers in all three schools used lunch menus.

4. Source of income.--The main source of income was from sales of lunches. The local school board fund was next in line.
5. Educational status of lunchroom personnel.--The study revealed:
 - a. One supervisor who served two schools had special training for the program.
 - b. The education of the workers ranged from eighth grade through four years of college work.
 - c. Sixty per cent of the personnel in the three schools received high school training.
6. The personnel and the types of markets involved in the purchase of foods.--The study revealed that the schools did not use a central purchasing agent.
7. Pay periods and aggregate pay.--The study revealed:
 - a. That one supervisor served both Butler and Stewart Schools.
 - b. The janitor worked as a part-time helper at the Butler School.
 - c. The Stewart and Butler Schools' schedule of pay is every two weeks.
 - d. The Christ Church School's pay schedule is every week.
8. Income received from sale of lunches and expenditures for labor.--The study revealed:
 - a. The Stewart and Butler Schools sold lunches at the price of twenty-five cents to all who ate lunch.
 - b. The Christ Church School sold lunches at the price of twenty-five and fifteen cents.
 - c. Christ Church School sold 94.6 per cent of their lunches for only fifteen cents.
 - d. Only 5.4 per cent of Christ Church School lunches were sold for twenty-five cents.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introductory statement.--In this chapter the summaries and basic findings have been organized and are presented under the following captions:

- a. Section I -- Recapitulation of the locale and research design.
- b. Section II -- Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations.

Recapitulation of the Locale and Research-Design

Prefatory statement.--The locale and research design pertinent to this research are presented in this section under the following captions:

Rationale--More and more educators are beginning to realize the important role that lunchroom programs play in the physical, mental and emotional development of children. The school lunch program is a natural setting for pupils to develop desirable food habits; to become better informed as to the kind and amounts of food needed by the body and why they are needed.

The school lunch was originated for the sole purpose of improving the child's daily nutritional in-take. However, the school lunchroom can become a remarkable educational resource for the children it feeds. It gives the teacher a unique opportunity to evaluate her pupils' eating practices. Also, young people can learn to eat and like a variety of foods; can become aware of the principles underlying the proper food-handling and preparation and the intelligent assessment of food values.

Furthermore, pupils may become cognizant of subtle matters such as: consumer costs; the relationship between food and culture; good table manners--and conversation; and generally, of the beneficial effects of a leisurely meal.

Locale and period--This study was conducted during the 1964-65 regular school term. The locale of the research was the Stewart Elementary School and the Christ Church School, Forrest City, Arkansas, and the Eldridge Butler Elementary School, Madison, Arkansas.

Subjects--The subjects involved in this study were approximately forty teachers in grades one through twelve, cafeteria supervisors, principals, and cafeteria managers of the Stewart and Eldridge Butler Elementary Schools, and the Christ Church School.

Instruments--The instruments used to collect the necessary data for this research were: (a) the specifically designed questionnaire, (b) the official school records, and (c) the interview whenever necessary.

Criterion of reliability--The "criterion of reliability for appraising the data is the accuracy and authenticity of the records, interviews, questionnaires, and the reactions of the subjects which constituted the source of the data.

Evolution of the problem--The study evolved basically from the writer's observation of the school lunch program in the school where she served as a lunchroom supervisor of six-year pupils for the past three years. The writer, who is a home economist, felt that there was a need to investigate the school lunch program in terms of its adequacy, as measured by recognized and acceptable standards.

Contribution to educational knowledge--The possible contribution to educational knowledge this study might have is the degree to which the findings are used as suggestive approaches in providing teachers, principals, and administrative personnel with useful data which will aid in evaluating and implementing a better lunchroom program in the Forrest City School District.

Statement of the problem--The problem involved in this study was to determine the "status" of the School Lunch Program, together with whatever educational opportunities are provided therein, in three schools in Saint Francis County, Arkansas, 1964-1965.

Purpose of the study--The major purpose of this study was to

survey and determine the present status of the three selective lunchroom programs in Saint Francis County, Arkansas, with reference to probable implications for the improvement of these programs. The specific purposes were to gain satisfactory answers to the one hundred and four questions listed in the questionnaire.

Scope and limitation of the study--This study was confined to the "status" of the school lunchroom programs in three selected schools in Saint Francis County, Arkansas, during the 1964-65 academic year.

Definition of terms--The significant basic terms used in this study are as follows:

1. "School lunchroom"--refers to any position of the school building in which food is cooked or otherwise prepared.
2. "Equipment"--refers to those utensils and fixtures which are used in the lunchroom.
3. "Supplies"--refers to the food stuffs that are prepared and served in school lunchrooms.
4. "Educative values"--refers to the influences and conditions which modify the behavior patterns of those persons who are recipients of the lunch.

Method of research--The Descriptive Survey method of research, using the specific techniques of the questionnaire, personal interview, and observation was used to collect the data requisite to the fulfillment of the purposes of this study.

Treatment of the data--The data obtained from the questionnaires, official records, and interviews were tabulated and presented in appropriate tables which in turn, were interpreted with the results as reported in Chapter III.

Summary of related literature--From the review of the related literature there seems to be consensus among authorities that (a) the school lunch program in addition to its contribution to the individual and social aspects of the child's growth and development, provides experiences which will enable the child to understand better some of the basic economic problems in everyday life; (b) that all foods and beverages which are available in the school should be those which contribute to the nutritional needs of the child and which aid him in the development of desirable food habits; (c) a school truly concerned with the broader aspects of child growth and development will adjust its curriculum to make maximum use of the

potentialities of every phase of the educative program, (d) that the school lunch program is a vital phase of the total program, and (e) candy, carbonated beverages, and other penny snatchers should be kept out of the school.

Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

Conclusions.---The analysis and interpretation of the data of this study appear to warrant the following conclusions:

1. The data revealed that there was a person directly responsible for the administration and operation of the cafeteria program in each school.
2. The data seem to warrant the conclusion that according to the National Standards the menus served in each school was a Type "A" pattern.
3. The data revealed that each of the buildings under study was located so as to provide optimum natural light and good cross ventilation.
4. The data revealed that physical examinations were not required for student help.
5. The data revealed that there was not an in-service training program for all school lunch personnel.
6. The data revealed that the schools were feeding eighty per cent of its total enrollment.
7. The data revealed that each of the plants met the minimum size of 750 square feet.
8. The data revealed that pasteurized milk was provided for every child daily.
9. The data revealed that sixty per cent of the personnel in the three schools had training at the high school level.
10. The data revealed that twenty minutes and more were allowed for children to eat lunch in all three schools.

Implications.---A careful analysis of the data of this study would appear to warrant the identification of the following implications:

1. There is an apparent need for a central purchasing agent.

2. There is an apparent need for an in-service training program in which the personnel of each school may be sufficiently trained in each of the lunchroom programs.
3. There is an apparent need that the in-service program include study and planning during pre- and post-planning weeks.
4. There is an apparent need for provisions for feeding more needy children.
5. There is an apparent need that more time be given in emphasizing the social habits and skills and developing the social graces.
6. There is an apparent need for an active cafeteria committee, with a staff that represents the entire school community to help improve the cafeteria program.
7. There is an apparent need for teachers and lay people to take an active part in the lunchroom program.

Recommendations.--The findings and conclusions of this study warrant certain recommendations for an improved school lunch program at Stewart Elementary School, Eldridge Butler Elementary School, and Christ Church School, Saint Francis County, Arkansas, in order to meet the educational and social needs of their pupils. The recommendations are:

1. That an in-service training program be provided in the school cafeteria, operation for all school personnel as part of the total school program.
2. That an active school cafeteria committee, composed of teachers, pupils, administrators, lay people, a physician and a nurse be organized to help plan, activate and evaluate the cafeteria program in each school.
3. That the windows in the Stewart Elementary School be screened with durable, non-rust materials and removable for window washing.
4. That provisions be made whereas all children are given an opportunity to eat in the lunchroom.
5. That provisions be made whereas the Stewart Elementary School cafeteria is accessible to the public without opening the entire building.

6. That a physical examination be required of all cafeteria workers.
7. That hoods and exhaust fans be installed over cooking equipment to eliminate grease vapors and steam in all three schools.
8. That a lounge with lockers, and toilet facilities for employees be provided in each school.
9. That enough space be provided in the lounge for one or two chairs, dressing table and mirror, and a first aid cabinet.
10. That a stack oven and dish washing machine be placed in the Christ Church School.
11. That a dish washing machine and a centralized dining area be provided for the Eldridge Butler School.
12. That a potato peeler and meat slicer be provided for all three schools.
13. That a trained manager be placed in the Christ Church School and relieve the Home Economics teacher.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Burgers, Anne. Malnutrition and Food Habits. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962.
- Jones, Edwinna. The Road to Health. Ohio: Laidlow Brothers, Inc., 1959.
- Martin, Ethel A. Roberts Nutrition Work With Children. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Rose, Mary Swartz. The Foundation of Nutrition. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.
- White, Lloyd. Guide for Planning School Plant. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1958.

Articles and Periodicals

- Agriculture Marketing Service, "A General Description of the National School Lunch Program," United States Department of Agriculture (August, 1964), 1.
- Battle, Lucretia F. "Proper Setting Stimulates Interest in the Noon Meal," Nation's School, XIV (September, 1954), 58.
- Bell, Millard D. "Need for a Lunchroom in An Elementary School," Nation's School, XLVII (October, 1953), 65.
- Hart, Constance C. "Training of Personnel in Standards," Journal of American Dietetics Association, XV (November, 1949), 740-41.
- Kriesberg, Martin. "Trends in the School Market for Food," Economic Research Service, (August, 1964), 33.
- Tibbets, Clara. "School Lunch Program," Arkansas School Food Service, (July, 1963), 9.

Bulletins

- Agriculture Extension Services, A Food Plan for Arkansas Families. Circular 128, Pine Bluff, 1960.

Arkansas School Food Service Association. "Proclamation 3552," North Little Rock, 1963.

Arkansas State Department of Education, "Planning School Lunch Departments," Circular 4.105, Little Rock, 1960.

Southern States Work Conference on Educational Problems. "School Lunch Policies and Standards," Tallahassee, 1952.

United States Census of Population, Arkansas, General, Social and Economic Characteristics. Population II, Little Rock, 1960.

Unpublished Materials

Bridges, Neill A. "A Survey of Three Elementary School Lunch Programs in Fulton County, Georgia," Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Education, Atlanta University, 1960.

Hicks, Charles. "The History of the School Lunch," A Report, School Lunch Division, Arkansas State Department of Education, Little Rock, Arkansas, 1965.

APPENDIX

AN APPRAISAL OF THE SCHOOL CAFETERIA PROGRAM

DIRECTIONS:

This check-list is designed to collect data on the school's cafeteria program. Most of the responses to the questions can be made by a simple check mark (X), placed in the proper blank space. This has kept writing out responses to a minimum. Please answer all of the questions. And, please follow the directions.

In passing, may I state that this check-list is being used to collect data for the research project which is partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master of Arts Degree at Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia. May I assure of my sincere thanks for your cooperation in this project through your execution of the check-list.

Teacher _____ School _____ Grade _____

PLEASE CHECK (X), COMPLETE, OR WRITE "NONE" IN EACH BLANK

1. Do you eat lunch with your class daily? Yes _____ No _____
2. In what capacity do you serve in the cafeteria? _____
3. What specific devices are used to promote pupil interest and participation in the lunch program?
 - a. Food models _____
 - b. Growing plants _____
 - c. Real vegetables _____
 - d. Live pets _____
 - e. Health posters _____
 - f. Others _____
4. What classroom techniques are used to motivate pupil participation in the lunchroom?
 - a. Making decoration for the classroom _____
 - b. Preparing and serving simple foods in the classroom _____
 - c. Tasting parties _____
 - d. Others _____
5. What specific devices are employed for transmitting dietary information to parents?
 - a. Food posters made by pupils _____
 - b. Reading material on food needs _____
 - c. School lunch menu _____
 - d. Others _____
6. How many of your students help with the lunch program daily? _____
In what capacity do they work?
 - a. Hostess _____
 - b. Dishwasher _____
 - c. Waitress _____
 - d. Others _____

7. What specific classroom activities related to the lunch program are used for developing dietary and manners of pupils? _____

- a. Writing menus _____
- b. Selecting lunch with food models _____
- c. Keeping a mock grocery story _____
- d. Conducting a mock lunch period _____
- e. Others _____

List other activities not confined to the classroom

8. What means are employed for determining the food habits of pupils at home?

- a. Keeping a daily chart of food eaten _____
- b. Writing menus of meals eaten at home _____
- c. Others _____

Principal _____ School _____

1. What is the total enrollment of your school? Pupils _____ Teachers _____
2. What is the average number bringing lunch daily? Pupils _____ Teachers _____
3. What is the average number bringing package lunch daily?
Pupils _____ Teachers _____
4. What foods are purchased most frequently to supplement these lunches?
Milk _____ Fruit _____ Vegetables _____ Others _____
5. Where do pupils eat their lunches?
Separate tables in the cafeteria _____ Playground _____ Other _____
6. How many shifts are used daily to serve lunch?
One _____; Two _____; Three _____; Four _____; Other _____.
7. What is the average number served free of cost? _____
8. Are foods other than the cafeteria lunch sold on your campus?
Yes _____ No _____. If yes, check beside the type food sold:
Candy _____ Fruit _____ Cookies _____ Sandwiches _____ Milk _____
9. What type lunch is served in your cafeteria?
Type A with milk _____ Type A without milk _____ Type B with Milk _____
Type B without milk _____ Type C with milk _____
10. What is the cost per lunch sold? Pupils _____ Teachers _____
11. How much time is allowed for each group to eat lunch? 15 minutes _____
20 minutes _____ 30 minutes _____ Other _____
12. By whom are meals planned? Manager _____; Dietician _____;
Supervisor _____; other _____
13. From what source or sources do you receive money for buying equipment?
A.
B.
C.
14. From what source do you receive money for food?
A.
B.
C.

15. From what source or sources do you receive money for paying workers' salaries?

A.

B.

C.

16. Please include copies of menus for five days.

17. Do you rate your cafeteria, How _____

18. What plans do you have for improving your lunchroom program?

County _____ Date _____

Name of School _____ Address _____

Type of School:

Elementary - Enrollment _____ No. of Teachers _____

Junior High - Enrollment _____ No. of Teachers _____

Senior High - Enrollment _____ No. of Teachers _____

Principal _____ Address _____

I. Organization and Administration of the School Cafeteria Program

A. Is there a person directly responsible for the administration and operation of the cafeteria in your school? Yes _____ No _____

B. Is there an active school cafeteria committee? Yes _____ No _____

1. Are teachers members of this committee? Yes _____ No _____

2. Are administrators members of this committee? Yes _____ No _____

3. Are pupils members of this committee? Yes _____ No _____

4. Are lay people members of this committee? Yes _____ No _____

5. Is a physician included on the committee? Yes _____ No _____

6. Is a nurse included on the committee? Yes _____ No _____

7. Does this committee meet regularly? Yes _____ No _____

8. Does the committee help plan, activate and evaluate the cafeteria program in the school? Yes _____ No _____

9. What degree of perfection does this evaluation show:

A. Health knowledge tests? None _____ Poor _____ Fair _____
Good _____ Excellent _____

b. Knowledge of pupils attitude toward program: None _____
Poor _____ Fair _____ Good _____ Excellent _____

c. Interviews and conferences with pupils, parents, cafeteria personnel and teachers? None _____ Poor _____
Fair _____ Good _____ Excellent _____

d. Observing practices of pupils in cafeteria: None _____
Poor _____ Fair _____ Good _____ Excellent _____

e. Encourage pupils and teachers to keep class records

participation and evaluate themselves through meaningful and purposeful experiences, such as graphing record of participation?

None _____ Poor _____ Fair _____ Good _____ Excellent _____

- f. What degree in the above information, if and when obtained, used to improve and evaluate cafeteria program? None _____ Poor _____ Fair _____ Good _____ Excellent _____

- C. Do members of the school personnel have training in the cafeteria program?

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|----------|
| 1. All _____ | Yes _____ | No _____ |
| 2. More than half _____ | Yes _____ | No _____ |
| 3. Less than half _____ | Yes _____ | No _____ |
| 4. Any at all _____ | Yes _____ | No _____ |

- a. Do all feel that they have responsibilities in the program? Yes _____ No _____

- b. Are there some who feel that they have responsibilities in the cafeteria program? Yes _____ No _____

- D. Is there an in-service training program in school cafeteria operation for all school personnel as part of the total school program? Yes _____ No _____

- E. Does this in-service program include:

1. Study and planning during pre- and post-planning weeks?
Yes _____ No _____
2. Study groups during school year? Yes _____ No _____

II. Scope of the School Cafeteria

- A. Structure and Equipment - Does the building meet the following standards?

1. Does the building meet the standards of allowing 10 to 12 feet per seat from each pupil? Yes _____ No _____
2. Planned to seat 40 per cent of the total anticipated enrollment? Yes _____ No _____
3. Located to provide optimum natural light and good cross ventilation? Yes _____ No _____
4. Located to avoid school lunch noises and odors being transmitted to other areas of the school plant? Yes _____ No _____
5. Located to provide for waiting lines (preferably contained within the dining space) in order to minimize admission to insects? Yes _____ No _____

6. Accessible to public without opening the entire building?
Yes _____ No _____
7. Are there sufficient flowers and plants to create an
aesthetic and pleasing environment? Yes _____ No _____
8. Attractive, clean and well kept? Yes _____ No _____

B. Equipment Placement and Use:

1. Are range and cook's table convenient to vegetable sink,
refrigerator and the section of serving counter where
hot foods are served? Yes _____ No _____
2. Are vegetable sinks and peeler near the point of
delivery, refrigerator and cooking areas? Yes _____ No _____
3. Is the baking area consisting of oven, baker's table
and cooking rack, near the cooking area, serving
counter, pot sink and refrigerator? Yes _____ No _____
4. Is the cooking equipment arranged perpendicular to
serving counter? Yes _____ No _____
5. Is the entire working area arranged in a right to left
direction? Yes _____ No _____

C. Sanitation

1. Is there an adequate supply of paper towels? Yes _____ No _____
2. Is either liquid soap or hand soap used for hand
washing? Yes _____ No _____
3. Are windows screened with durable, non-rust materials
and removable for window washing? Yes _____ No _____
4. Are the dining walls washable for 4 to 6 feet from the
floor? Yes _____ No _____
5. Are the kitchen walls washable? Yes _____ No _____

III. School Lunch

A. Does the school have adequate facilities for a school lunch
program? Yes _____ No _____

1. Is the lunch program receiving Federal Aid? Yes _____ No _____
2. Is the school refraining from selling soft drinks and
package food? Yes _____ No _____

3. Is the lunchroom inspected, regularly by the Department of Public Health? Yes _____ No _____
 4. Are physical examinations required for school lunch personnel and student help? Yes _____ No _____
 5. Do school lunch personnel have training in sanitation and proper methods of food care? Yes _____ No _____
- B. Do all children eat in the lunchroom? Yes _____ No _____
1. Do all children eat lunch? Yes _____ No _____
 2. Are 80 per cent or more of the children participating in the school lunch program? Yes _____ No _____
 3. Are all children provided a hot lunch? Yes _____ No _____
 4. Is anything being done to increase the participation in the lunch program? Yes _____ No _____
 5. Are the children who bring packed lunches given an opportunity to eat in the cafeteria? Yes _____ No _____
 6. Is pasteurized milk provided for every child daily?
Yes _____ No _____
 7. Are free meals given to children who need them? Yes _____ No _____
- C. Is 20 minutes or more allowed for children to each lunch exclusive of the time consumed in washing hands, standing in line? Yes _____ No _____
1. Are all children encouraged to remain at the table until each child has had ample time to eat lunch? Yes _____ No _____
 2. Are children allowed adequate time to wash hands before eating? Yes _____ No _____
 3. Do children return immediately to classrooms from cafeteria? Yes _____ No _____
 4. Is sufficient time given in emphasizing the social habits and skills and developing the social graces? Yes _____ No _____
- D. Is there evidence that the school lunch program is bringing about positive learning experiences to pupils either directly or through classroom integration? Yes _____ No _____

VITA

MOOREHEAD, TEMPIE WILLIAMS

Education:

Attended elementary school in Madison, Arkansas;
secondary school in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. B. S.
Degree in Home Economics, Agricultural, Mechanical
and Normal College, Pine Bluff, Arkansas

Personal Information:

Married, mother of one son; member of Madison
Light Baptist Church, Madison, Arkansas

Member of: National Education Association, American
Teachers Association, Arkansas Teachers Association,
Eureka Federated Club.